

1 By letter dated July 29, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel
2 (DOP). Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Information Technology
3 Applications Specialist (ITAS) 5 classification.

4 On April 5, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of
5 Appellant's position. By letter dated June 6, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
6 position was properly allocated to the ITAS 4 classification. On June 23, 2000, Appellant appealed
7 the Director's determinations to the Personnel Appeals Board. On August 10, 2000, Appellant
8 provided his specific exceptions. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

9
10 Appellant supervises technical staff in the LANS Applications Unit of Respondent's Finance
11 Division Information Technology Office. Appellant is responsible for all computer related tasks for
12 the LAN system.

13 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant contends that Respondent utilized a CQ process
14 that was in violation of the DOP and merit system procedures; that Respondent failed to implement
15 salary increases approved by SSB 6767 before allocating his position; that Respondent failed to
16 apply the allocation "cross-walk" intended to be used in conjunction with the new information
17 technology classes; and that the agency applied arbitrary, agency-dependent allocation criteria
18 contrary to the intent of civil service management principles and the intent of the PRB. Appellant
19 disagrees with director's designee's finding that the intent of the class study was to enhance the
20 discretion permitted to agencies through delegated allocation decision-making authority.

21
22 Appellant argues that the Finance Division is a major component of DSHS and that he functions as
23 a project leader for projects with large, critical impact to the agency. Appellant contends that he
24 functions as a technical specialist and is responsible for major applications and projects that impact
25 a critical agency program. Appellant asserts that his position should be allocated to the ITAS 5
26 classification.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the process used to update
2 Appellant's CQ ensured that the duties of his position were accurately described and that Appellant
3 did not dispute the duties described in his updated CQ. Respondent asserts that the class
4 specifications and salary increases were adopted by the PRB to be effective on July 1, 1999, which
5 is the effective date of Appellant's reallocation. Respondent asserts that the "cross-walk" document
6 was a guideline provided by DOP and was not an allocating criteria adopted by the PRB.
7 Respondent contends that the agency has delegated allocating authority and that they consistently
8 interpreted and applied the specifications in a manner consistent with the intent of the PRB.
9 Respondent further contends that the purpose of the class study was to update the specifications to
10 reflect current duties and responsibilities, to relieve recruitment and retention problems, and to give
11 each agency flexibility in the use of the classes.

12
13 Respondent argues that Appellant works solely in support of the Finance Division which is not a
14 major, mission critical division and that his duties and responsibilities are not critical to the
15 fulfillment of the agency's overall mission. Rather, Respondent asserts that the Finance Division is
16 a moderate function that does not have a critical impact on the mission of the agency. Respondent
17 asserts that applications are considered low risk and do not constitute a vital service to DSHS
18 client's and the public. Therefore, Respondent argues that Appellant's position is properly allocated
19 to the ITAS 4 classification.

20
21 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
22 allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.

23 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Applications Specialist 4, class code 03294,
24 and Information Technology Applications Specialist 5, class code 03295.

1 **Decision of the Board.** Appellant raises a number of issues that are outside of the allocation
2 process. For example, Appellant challenges the intent and process used for implementation of the
3 class study and resulting salary increases, and challenges the criteria used by the agency in making
4 their allocation decisions. These issues fall outside of the purpose of an allocation review which is
5 to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's
6 position.

7 A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the
8 available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best
9 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington
10 State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

11
12 Position allocations are “based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
13 performed and other information and recommendations.” (WAC 356-20-200). To assist agencies
14 with implementing the class study, DOP created a "cross-walk" guideline. This document is not,
15 nor was it intended to be, an allocating criteria for the Information Technology Class Study.

16 Because a current and accurate description of a position’s duties and responsibilities is documented
17 in an approved classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for
18 allocation of a position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and
19 responsibilities, as documented in the CQ. Jacobson v. Dept of Ecology, PAB No. ALLO 99-0004
20 (2000).

21
22 In this case, Appellant's CQ was changed after Appellant completed it. Subsequent to the changes,
23 Appellant signed the CQ. While we do not support using a CQ that has not been completed by an
24 incumbent to allocate a filled position, Appellant has failed to show that the CQ used to allocate his
25 position did not describe his duties and responsibilities.

1 In determining the proper allocation of Appellant's position, we have considered the duties and
2 responsibilities assigned and/or performed by Appellant in comparison to the existing classification
3 specifications. Although we did not base our decision on the allocating criteria developed by the
4 agency, their criteria appears to be consistent with the intent of the language adopted by the PRB.

5 At the ITAS 5 level, incumbents are professional, technical specialists whose positions focus on and
6 are responsible for agency-level, large-scale applications, projects or databases that have high risk
7 and impact. Incumbents at this level utilize broad technical knowledge in analyzing, consulting,
8 designing, programming, maintaining, or supporting major applications, support products, projects,
9 databases or database management systems. Incumbents at this level usually supervise or lead
10 others.

11
12 The majority of Appellant's area of responsibility does not have the level of impact intended to be
13 encompassed by the ITAS 5 classification. Appellant's duties and responsibilities are confined to a
14 single division of the agency. Appellant is not responsible for agency-level, large-scale
15 applications that impact an agency critical program.

16 At the ITAS 4 level, incumbents perform senior, professional level duties with a focus on system
17 specific applications, rather than agency-wide applications, and are responsible for "multiple
18 applications of moderate size/complexity or a large, major application that is vital to program
19 delivery." In addition, incumbents are required to have an awareness of impact across business
20 units and incumbents may supervise other staff.

21
22 Appellant's position is best described by the ITAS 4 classification. He supervises staff and is
23 responsible for moderate risk applications that impact approximately 250 staff members of the
24 financial division. Appellant is responsible for the applications that are vital to the programs the
25 LANS Applications Unit delivers to the division. These duties and responsibilities are
26 encompassed by the ITAS 4 classification.

1 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the
2 Director, dated June 6, 2000, should be affirmed.
3

4 **ORDER**

5 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
6 denied and the Director's determination, dated June 6, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is
7 attached.

8 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.
9

10 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
11

12 _____
13 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair
14

15 _____
16 Leana D. Lamb, Member
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26